

REMARKS

By this Amendment, claims 1, 4, 9-11, 24, 30-32, 44, 47, 52-54, 68 and 70-72 are amended, claim 67 is canceled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter recited therein, and claim 73 is added. Therefore, claims 1-5, 7-25, 27-48, 50-66, 68 and 70-73 are pending in this application. No new matter is added. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Applicants thank Examiner Brier for the courtesies extended to Applicants' representatives during the February 16 personal interview and February 23 telephone interview. During the February 16 personal interview, Examiner Brier agreed that the amendments to the claims with respect to the "at least one of" language is acceptable. During the February 23 telephone interview, Examiner Brier agreed that amendments to claims 70-72 and new claim 73 are acceptable.

Applicants note with appreciation the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 1-5, 7-25, 27-48, 50-66 and 68. By this Amendment, claims 1, 9-11, 24, 30-32, 44, 47, 52-54 and 68 are amended to obviate the objections and the 112 rejection. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully understand that these claims are allowed.

The Office Action objects to claims 68 and 72. These claims are amended to obviate the objection. As such, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claim 67 under 35 U.S.C. §101. Claim 67 is canceled by the Amendment. As such, this rejection is moot. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-5, 7-25, 27-48 and 50-67 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. By this Amendment, claims 1, 4, 9-11, 30-32, 47, and 52-54 are amended to obviate the rejection as discussed and agreed to during the interview. Claim 44 is also amended similarly to claim 1.

With respect to claims 21, 41 and 64, the phrase "at least one of" is proper because the specification describes at paragraph [0037], for example, that "any" characteristics of the digital ink can be changed, such as color, thickness, fade or duration time or any other known or later developed display characteristics of the digital ink, such as shape of the digital ink. Although this paragraph uses a word "or," it is clear that these examples can be used together, and such would be within the understanding of the invention. In addition, the specification states at paragraph [0078], for example, one of ordinary skill in the art would consider the use of more than one example would be a modification without departing from the scope of this invention.

Claims 2, 3, 7, 8, 12-25, 27-29, 33-46, 48, 50, 51 and 55-67 depend from rejected claims.

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

With respect to the Office Action's suggestion of changing "an intonational phrase" to ---or an intonational phrase--, Applicants respectfully submit that it is grammatically correct since it is preceded by "based on one of."

The Office Action rejects claims 70-72 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over "Collaborative Design with NetDraw; Proceedings of Computer Aided Architectural Design (CAAD) Futures '99" by Dongqui Qian and M. D. Gross (Qian). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 70 and 72 recite selecting a faded or fading digital ink and recovering only the selected faded or fading digital ink.

The Office Action alleges that Qian's snapshots correspond to the recovery feature. In particular, the Office Action asserts that a selected snapshot icon has digital ink that is fading or faded from the current drawing. However, as discussed and agreed to during the February 23 telephone conference, the alleged snapshot, if selected, would recover all of the image to a

prior stage. Thus, Qian does not teach or suggest recovering only the selected faded or fading digital ink.

As such, Qian does not teach or suggest these features. According, claims 70 and 72 are patentable over Qian.

Claim 71 recites a controller for selecting fading or faded digital ink for recovery and a digital ink recovery system that recovers only the selected fading or faded digital ink. As discussed above, Qian does not teach or suggest the recovery. Thus, claim 71 is patentable over Qian.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

New claim 73 recites that the selected faded or fading digital ink is recovered to a fadable state. This feature is described in the specification at, for example, paragraph [0050]. As discussed during the February 16 personal interview and the February 23 telephone interview, none of the applied references teaches or suggests this feature. As such, claim 73 is patentable at least for its dependence on claim 70, as well as for the additional feature it recite.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the application are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Stephen P. Catlin
Registration No. 36,101

JAO:KXH/hs

Date: March 13, 2006

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--